

CP4A Concurrence Meeting 4/12/11) – The Merger Process Team held a Concurrence Meeting on April 12, 2011 to discuss Avoidance & Minimization for Alternate 2A of the Maysville Bypass. The Team changed the LEDPA to Alternate 2A on May 25, 2010. The jurisdictional impacts for Section B have been avoided and minimized to the maximum extent practicable based on preliminary design plans dated April 4, 2011 that were presented during this meeting utilizing horizontal alignment shifts, vertical adjustments, a 46-foot median width, perpendicular stream crossing, using 3-to-1 slopes in wetlands, locating service roads and turnarounds in non-jurisdictional areas, elimination of proposed interchanges at the northern and southern termini, and bridging the White Oak River and a tributary of the White Oak River. The Merger Process Team signed the concurrence form.

The concurrence forms are presented in Appendix A.

8.1.4 Agency Comments on the State Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Agency: United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4

Letter Date: February 22, 2005

Comments/Responses:

Comment: “The noise wall evaluation was conducted using the 1999 NCDOT Noise Policy of \$25,000 per benefited receptor. This evaluation needs to be updated using the Noise Policy and the ‘sliding-scale’ threshold of \$35,000 per benefited receptor.”

Response: This revision was made in the SFEIS.

Comment: “EPA was unable to identify the qualifying criteria for determining the quality characteristics of the wetland systems (i.e., Low, medium and high). It would also be helpful to acknowledge if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has concurred with these determinations.”

Response: “USACE observed wetlands and streams during a March 6, 2007 Northern Field meeting that were not shown on the environmental mapping for the August 2000 USACE jurisdictional Determination. USACE also questioned whether a particular pine stand should have been considered a jurisdictional area, and observed apparent changes in land use and drainage patterns. Therefore, USACE rendered a decision on March 7, 2007 that the jurisdictional delineation for the entire project would need to be reevaluated and reverified with USACE prior to any further discussions on corridor selection. This work was performed and the